

Johann Rush
P.O.Box 563
Hattiesburg, MS 39403

4/8/86

Dear Johann,

As I told you in the letter you distort and misrepresent in your 4/2, I will not now carry on such pointless correspondence. This ends it so far as I am concerned.

You state that I called you names, unimportant and that I've "kept a file on me (i.e., you) for more than 20 years," all of which is false. And in all of this foolish, self-important kid stuff you ignore ~~my~~ what I actually said in response to your actual complaint, that I had not referred Henry Hurt to you. I said I had not referred him to anyone. He was, in fact, well into his work and writing when he was first in touch with me.

I do now call you names: pest, nuisance and petty. These are even less tolerable now that you are, I presume, 20 years older and you know the state of my health and limitations. (Of course if you want to twist my saying that I didn't refer Henry to you or to anyone else into the interpretation that I said you are unimportant, I can't stop you, or the self-characterization in it.)

Neither now nor at any time in the past have I had any interest in you, or what for lack of a better name might be referred to as your work and thus I have not made or "kept" any file "on" you. I do and from the first have had a file on your footage, hardly the same thing, and hardly something to be ignored in this subject. With regard to it, you say that you "provided a high-quality copy of rare film of Oswald to your (meaning my) and Jim Garrison's investigation..." What you gave Garrison through Bill Turner is not "high quality" and you gave me nothing. I have an infinitely better print provided by WDSU, all properly signed for, with stipulated restrictions, when Ed Planer was news director - or before Turner looked you up. (Made at Panamerican.)

If you want to pretend that two bystanders, at least one of whom is hardly "young," were with Oswald, you have that right. But I know there was at least one other, besides Steele, with him because two dependable people saw and described him to me - and his dress, and because he is also described in more than one FBI record. But so far as your accuracy is concerned, the captioned xerox of a frame of your footage, which manages to omit known names, you refer to John Alice, I think an importer and I know with an office in the old ITM building, as its janitor. (The "Japanese ^{Businessman} ~~Reporter~~" of your caption is named Ehara and he was then an importer.) I have no personal objection to your describing yourself as "a primary witness to part of Oswald's New Orleans activity," although I might voice a factual objection, as I do to your entirely unsupported interpretations of what remains of your footage, the rest, "primary witness that you think you are having been discarded. You were so sharp an understanding of a "primary witness" that instead of following up what you didn't begin to understand you took Delores Neeley to lunch, which Jesse Core told me.

And before you twist it farther, the "one unidentified young man" I referred to is not in your footage. Nor was he dressed as one of those passers-by looking at what Oswald was handing out.

I can't say, as I thought I might, goodbye, Sherlock, because Sherlock you are not. But I can and do say goodbye, silly, self-important, incompetent boy.

Heard